

HONORABLE THOMAS S. ZILLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

HUNTERS CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE,

Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-00983-TSZ

CITY OF SEATTLE'S ANSWER  
TO SECOND AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT

The City of Seattle (City), by and through its undersigned attorneys of record, hereby answers Plaintiffs' Second Amended Class Action Complaint (Dkt. 28) as follows.

**I. OVERVIEW**

1. The City admits that the United States Constitution states what is stated therein. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in the second and third sentences of paragraph 1 and therefore denies them.

2. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in the first and second sentences of paragraph 2 and therefore denies them. The City denies the allegations in the third sentence of paragraph 2.

3. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 3.

4. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 4.

13. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the characterizations of the plaintiffs in paragraph 13 and therefore denies them. The City denies the remainder of paragraph 13.

19. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph

19 and therefore denies them.

20. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 20 and therefore denies them.

21. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 21 and therefore denies them.

22. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 22 and therefore denies them.

23. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 23 and therefore denies them.

24. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 24 and therefore denies them.

25. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 25 and therefore denies them.

26. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 26 and therefore denies them.

27. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 27 and therefore denies them.

28. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 28 and therefore denies them.

29. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 29 and therefore denies them.

30. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 30 and therefore denies them.

31. The City admits that the City of Seattle is a municipality within the State of Washington, that the Seattle Police Department is a department of the City, that Jenny Durkan is

1 the Mayor of the City, that the Mayor of the City is the chief executive officer of the City, and that  
2 the Mayor of the City is a policymaker for the City, and denies the remaining allegations of  
3 paragraph 31.

### 4 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 32. Paragraph 32 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

6 33. Paragraph 33 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

### 7 **IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 34. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 34.

9 35. The City admits that it used barriers in managing the Cal Anderson Park area during  
10 June 2020 and otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 35.

11 36. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 36.

12 37. The City admits that during June 2020 some people called the Cal Anderson Park  
13 area Free Capitol Hill, CHAZ, and CHOP and otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 37.

14 38. The City admits that the area referred to as the CHOP was bounded approximately  
15 by East Denny Way, 13th Avenue, East Pike Street, and Broadway and that Cal Anderson Park  
16 and sixteen city blocks are within that area, and otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 38.

17 39. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 39.

18 40. The City denies the allegations of paragraph 40.

19 41. The City admits that during June 2020 there were tents on some streets, sidewalks,  
20 and Cal Anderson Park, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether the photographs  
21 depict what they are claimed to depict and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the  
22 allegations of paragraph 41.

23 42. The City admits that during June 2020 persons painted graffiti on surfaces in the  
24 Cal Anderson Park area and that during June 2020 some property owners and the City removed or  
25 painted over graffiti on surfaces in the Cal Anderson Park area, lacks sufficient information to

1 admit or deny whether some business owners were threatened with retaliation and therefore denies  
2 the same, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether the photographs depict what they  
3 are claimed to depict and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the allegations of  
4 paragraph 42.

5 43. The City admits that persons sold food and other items during the time and in the  
6 area at issue, but otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 43.

7 44. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
8 44 and therefore denies the same.

9 45. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny that persons demanded  
10 business owners release individuals who were caught committing crimes or that persons attempted  
11 to perform their own crime investigations and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the  
12 allegations of paragraph 45.

13 46. The City admits that speeches, debates, movies, music, and various other activities  
14 occurred during the time and in the area at issue, but otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph  
15 46.

16 47. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
17 47 and therefore denies the same.

18 48. The City admits that Cal Anderson Park was within the area described by some  
19 persons as the CHOP, is approximately 7 acres in area, and is owned by the City. The City admits  
20 that the City provided hand-washing stations and portable toilets during the time and in the area at  
21 issue. The City otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 48.

22 49. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 49 and lacks sufficient information to  
23 admit or deny whether the photographs depict what they are claimed to depict and therefore denies  
24 the same.

25 50. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether local residents were

1 threatened and therefore denies that allegation, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny  
2 whether the photographs depict what they are claimed to depict and therefore denies the same, and  
3 otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 50.

4 51. The City admits that persons planted gardens in Cal Anderson Park during the time  
5 at issue, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether the photographs depict what they  
6 are claimed to depict and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the allegations in  
7 paragraph 51.

8 52. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether any of plaintiffs'  
9 properties overlook, border, or are adjacent to Cal Anderson Park or to admit or deny what  
10 plaintiffs saw and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 52.

11 53. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
12 53 and therefore denies the same.

13 54. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 54.

14 55. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 55.

15 56. The City admits that Seattle Police Department Chief Carmen Best said what she  
16 said and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 56.

17 57. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 57.

18 58. The City admits that two persons were shot in the approximate area and during the  
19 approximate time specified, that one of the persons shot died and that no persons have been  
20 criminally charged as perpetrators of the shootings. The City otherwise denies the allegations in  
21 paragraph 58.

22 59. The City admits that the video purports to show what it purports to show, but  
23 otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 59.

24 60. The City admits that a person was shot in the approximate area and during the  
25 approximate time specified, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny how the person was

1 transported and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 60.

2 61. The City admits that Seattle Police Department Chief Carmen Best said what she  
3 said and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 61.

4 62. The City admits that two persons were shot in the approximate area and during the  
5 approximate time specified and that one of the people who was shot died, and lacks sufficient  
6 information to admit or deny the condition of the second person and therefore denies the same.  
7 The City otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 62.

8 63. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
9 63 and therefore denies the same.

10 64. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny how the persons were  
11 transported and therefore denies the same, and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 64.

12 65. The City admits that the SPD blotter said what it said and that no persons have been  
13 criminally charged as perpetrators of the shooting. The City otherwise denies the allegations of  
14 paragraph 65.

15 66. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
16 66 and therefore denies the same.

17 67. The City admits that two persons died after being shot in the approximate area and  
18 at the approximate time at issue. The City is without sufficient information to admit or deny the  
19 remaining information in paragraph 67, in part because the City does not know how plaintiffs  
20 define the boundaries of “the Capitol Hill neighborhood.”

21 68. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 68.

22 69. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 69.

23 70. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 70.

24 71. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 71.

25 72. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 72.

1           73.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 73.

2           74.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 74.

3           75.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 75.

4           76.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 76.

5           77.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 77.

6           78.     The City admits that Seattle Police Department Chief Carmen Best said what she  
7 said and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 78.

8           79.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 79.

9           80.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 80.

10          81.     The City denies the allegations in paragraph 81.

11          82.     The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph  
12 82 and therefore denies the same.

13          83.     The City denies the first, second, and fifth sentences of paragraph 83. The City  
14 lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 83 and  
15 therefore denies the same.

16          84.     The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations paragraph 84  
17 and therefore denies the same.

18          85.     The City denies the last sentence of paragraph 85. The City lacks sufficient  
19 information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 85 and therefore denies the  
20 same.

21          86.     The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
22 86 and therefore denies the same.

23          87.     The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
24 87 and therefore denies the same.

25          88.     The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph



1 88 and therefore denies the same.

2 89. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
3 89 and therefore denies the same.

4 90. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
5 90 and therefore denies the same.

6 91. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 91.

7 92. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
8 92 and therefore denies the same.

9 93. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
10 93 and therefore denies the same.

11 94. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 94.

12 95. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
13 95 and therefore denies the same.

14 96. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
15 96 and therefore denies the same.

16 97. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
17 97 and therefore denies the same.

18 98. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
19 98 and therefore denies the same.

20 99. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 99.

21 100. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
22 100 and therefore denies the same.

23 101. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
24 101 and therefore denies the same.

25 102. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph

102 and therefore denies the same.

103. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 103 and therefore denies the same.

104. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 104 and therefore denies the same.

105. The City denies that it ignored anyone's concerns. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 105 and therefore denies the same.

106. The City admits that Capitol Hill is a diverse neighborhood, that it is known for its minority presence and as a center for Seattle's LGBTQ+ community, and that many small business owners in the area are minority owned. The City otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 106.

107. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 107 and therefore denies the same.

108. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 108 and therefore denies the same.

109. The City denies that the actions it took constituted "support" for the CHOP. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 105 and therefore denies the same.

110. The City admits that it provided hand-washing stations and portable toilets in the area and during the time at issue. The City denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 110.

111. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 111 and therefore denies the same.

112. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 112 and therefore denies the same.

1           113. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
2 113 and therefore denies the same.

3           114. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
4 114 and therefore denies the same.

5           115. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
6 115 and therefore denies the same.

7           116. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
8 116 and therefore denies the same.

9           117. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
10 117 and therefore denies the same.

11           118. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
12 118 and therefore denies the same.

13           119. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
14 119 and therefore denies the same.

15           120. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
16 120 and therefore denies the same.

17           121. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
18 121 and therefore denies the same.

19           122. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
20 122 and therefore denies the same.

21           123. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
22 123 and therefore denies the same.

23           124. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
24 124 and therefore denies the same.

25           125. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph

1 125 and therefore denies the same.

2 126. The City denies that the City is responsible for any losses and otherwise lacks  
3 sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 126 and therefore denies the  
4 same.

5 127. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
6 127 and therefore denies the same.

7 128. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
8 128 and therefore denies the same.

9 129. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
10 129 and therefore denies the same.

11 130. The City admits that the identified writing says what it says but otherwise denies the  
12 allegations of paragraph 130.

13 131. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
14 131 and therefore denies the same.

15 132. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
16 132 and therefore denies the same.

17 133. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
18 133 and therefore denies the same.

19 134. The City denies that the City enabled lawlessness and otherwise lacks sufficient  
20 information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 134 and therefore denies the same.

21 135. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
22 135 and therefore denies the same.

23 136. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
24 136 and therefore denies the same.

25 137. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph

1 137 and therefore denies the same.

2 138. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
3 138 or that the photograph depicts what it is claimed to depict and therefore denies the same.

4 139. The City denies the first sentence of paragraph 139. The City lacks sufficient  
5 information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 139 and therefore denies the  
6 same.

7 140. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
8 140 and therefore denies the same.

9 141. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
10 141 and therefore denies the same.

11 142. The City denies that it is responsible for the losses plaintiffs allege. The City lacks  
12 sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 142 and therefore  
13 denies the same.

14 143. The City admits the first sentence of paragraph 143. The City denies the remaining  
15 allegations in paragraph 143.

16 144. The City denies that it “supported the ongoing occupation of CHOP.” The City  
17 lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 144 and  
18 therefore denies the same.

19 145. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
20 145 and therefore denies the same.

21 146. The City admits that Hunters Capital wrote to the City but denies the remainder of  
22 the last sentence of paragraph 146. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the  
23 remaining allegations of paragraph 146 and therefore denies the same.

24 147. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
25 147 and therefore denies the same.

1           148. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
2 148 and therefore denies the same.

3           149. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
4 149 and therefore denies the same.

5           150. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
6 150 and therefore denies the same.

7           151. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
8 151 and therefore denies the same.

9           152. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
10 152 and therefore denies the same.

11           153. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
12 153 and therefore denies the same.

13           154. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 154.

14           155. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
15 155 and therefore denies the same.

16           156. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
17 156 and therefore denies the same.

18           157. The City denies that it is responsible for the damages plaintiffs allege. The City  
19 lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 157 and  
20 therefore denies the same.

21           158. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
22 158 and therefore denies the same.

23           159. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph  
24 159 and therefore denies the same.

25           160. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph

160 and therefore denies the same.

161. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 161 and therefore denies the same.

162. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 162 and therefore denies the same.

163. The City lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of paragraph 163 and therefore denies the same.

164. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 164.

165. The City admits that persons said what they said, that the City stated what it stated, and that Mayor Durkan personally visited the area at issue during the time period at issue. The City otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 165.

166. The City admits that Mayor Durkan's order effective July 1, 2020, states what it states. The City otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 166.

167. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 167.

168. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 168.

169. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 169.

170. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 170.

171. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 171.

172. The City admits that persons said what they said and that the City stated what it stated. The City denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 172.

173. The City admits that persons said what they said and that the City stated what it stated. The City denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 173.

174. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 174.

175. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 175.

**V. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

176. The City admits that the plaintiffs seek what they seek.

177. The City admits that the plaintiffs seek what they seek.

178. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 178.

179. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 179.

180. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 180.

181. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 181.

182. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 182.

183. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 183.

184. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 184.

185. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 185.

**VI. CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS**

186. The City responds to each allegation as it responded before.

187. Paragraph 187 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

188. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 188.

189. Paragraph 189 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

190. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 190.

191. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 191.

192. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 192.

193. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 193.

194. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 194.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS**

195. The City responds to each allegation as it responded before.

196. Paragraph 196 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.



197. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 197.

198. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 198.

199. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 199.

200. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 200.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – TAKING**

201. The City responds to each allegation as it responded before.

202. Paragraph 202 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

203. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 203.

204. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 204.

205. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 205.

206. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 206.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – NEGLIGENCE**

207. The City responds to each allegation as it responded before.

208. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 208.

209. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 209.

210. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 210.

211. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 211.

212. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 212.

213. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 213.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – NUISANCE**

214. The City responds to each allegation as it responded before.

215. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 215.

216. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 216.

217. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 217.

218. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 218.

1           219. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 219.

2           220. The City denies the allegations in paragraph 220.

3                                   **VII. JURY DEMAND**

4           The City acknowledges the plaintiffs' demand for a trial by jury.

5                                   **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6           No answer is required to the plaintiffs' prayer for relief.

7                                   **AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES**

8           Without assuming any burden it would not otherwise bear, the City asserts the following  
9 affirmative and other defenses.

10           1. Plaintiffs and putative class members fail to state a claim upon which relief may be  
11 granted.

12           2. The claims of plaintiffs and putative class members may be barred, in whole or in  
13 part, by application of the doctrine of discretionary immunity.

14           3. The claims of plaintiffs and putative class members may be barred, in whole or in  
15 part, by application of the public duty doctrine.

16           4. The damages of plaintiffs and putative class members, if any, may have been  
17 caused or contributed to by the fault of other entities or persons, some of whose identities may  
18 never be determined but whose actions are outlined in the plaintiffs' complaint.

19           5. The damages of plaintiffs and putative class members, if any, may be reduced for  
20 failure to take reasonable steps to mitigate damages.

21           6. The claims of plaintiffs and putative class members may be barred, in whole or in  
22 part, by their contributory fault or contributory negligence.

23           7. The claims of plaintiffs and putative class members may be barred, in whole or in  
24 part, by their assumption of risk.

25           8. The claims of plaintiffs and putative class members are barred for failure to give

1 timely notice of a tort claim before commencing the action.

2 9. Plaintiffs Onxy Homeowners Association, Madrona Real Estate Services LLC,  
3 Madrona Real Estate Investors IV LLC, Madrona Real Estate Investors VI LLC, 12th and Pike  
4 Associates LLC, Hunters Capital, LLC, Olive ST Apartments LLC, and Redside Partners LLC  
5 lack standing to sue for damages allegedly incurred by the tenants, residents, and owners in the  
6 buildings they manage and / or own.

7 DATED this 13th day of November, 2020.

8 PETER S. HOLMES  
9 Seattle City Attorney

10 By: s/ Joseph Groshong  
11 Joseph Groshong, WSBA# 41593  
12 Assistant City Attorney  
13 Seattle City Attorney's Office  
14 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050  
15 Seattle, WA 98104  
16 Tel: (206) 684-8200  
17 Fax: (206) 684-8284  
18 Joseph.Groshong@seattle.gov

16 HARRIGAN LEYH FARMER & THOMSEN LLP

17 By: s/ Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.  
18 By: s/ Tyler L. Farmer  
19 By: s/ Kristin E. Ballinger  
20 Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751  
21 Tyler L. Farmer, WSBA #39912  
22 Kristin E. Ballinger, WSBA #28253  
23 999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400  
24 Seattle, WA 98104  
25 Tel: (206) 623-1700  
Fax: (206) 623-8717  
arthurh@harriganleyh.com  
tylerf@harriganleyh.com  
kristinb@harriganleyh.com

*Attorneys for City of Seattle*